

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CNB 44332)
United States Attorney

BRIAN STRETCH (CABN 163973)
Chief, Criminal Division

DENISE MARIE BARTON (MABN 634052)
Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-7359
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234
E-mail: denise.barton@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JEFFREY BENJAMIN HARRISON,

Defendant.

No. CR 07-0594 PJH

**ERRATA RE: MEMORANDUM IN
OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO SUPPRESS
EVIDENCE AND REQUEST FOR AN
EVIDENTIARY HEARING**

Hearing Date: April 9, 2008, 2:30 p.m.
Courtroom: 17-3

COMES NOW, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and hereby files this Errata Re:
Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Suppress Evidence and Request for an Evidentiary
Hearing, in the form of the Table of Contents and the Table of Authorities which are attached
hereto.

DATED: March 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
United States Attorney

/s/ Denise Barton
DENISE M. BARTON
Assistant United States Attorney

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
FACTUAL BACKGROUND.	2
ARGUMENT.	4
I. COMPUTERS AND OTHER ELECTRONIC STORAGE DEVICES ARE SUBJECT TO SEARCH AT THE BORDER AND DO NOT REQUIRE REASONABLE SUSPICION AS A PREDICATE TO SEARCH.	4
A. Customs Officials Have Longstanding Plenary Authority under the Fourth Amendment to Conduct Suspicionless Searches of Personal Property at the International Border.	5
1. Suspicionless Border Searches of Property Are Deeply Embedded in the Nation’s History and Justified by the Government’s Paramount Interest in Border Security.	5
2. Travelers Crossing the Border Have a Substantially Diminished Expectation of Privacy in Their Personal Belongings and Effects.	7
3. Searches of Closed Containers and Items of Personal Property Contained Therein May Be Conducted Without Particularized Suspicion.	8
4. The Defendant Relies on a Discarded Distinction Between “Routine” and “Non-Routine” Border Searches of Property.	9
B. Computer Storage Devices Are Neither Conceptually Nor Constitutionally Different than Other Closed Storage Containers Subject to Suspicionless Border Searches.	10
1. Courts Have Recognized That No Suspicion Is Required to Search Computer Media at the Border.	11
2. Computer Storage Devices Are Conceptually Identical to Closed Storage Containers.	13
3. The Arnold Court’s View of Computer Searches as Invasions of the Mind Lacks Merit.	15
C. Suspicionless Computer Searches Are Essential to Vindicate the Government’s Paramount Interest in Border Security.	15

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

PAGE

II.	ATTORNEY FILES - HARD COPY OR ELECTRONIC - HAVE NEVER BEEN AND SHOULD NOT BE INSULATED FROM SEARCHES BY THE GOVERNMENT.....	16
A.	Attorneys Files Are Subject to Reasonable Searches Like Any Other Property.....	18
B.	A Border Search of Attorney Files is Not An Unreasonable Search In Violation of the Fourth Amendment.....	19
1.	Attorneys, Like Other Travelers, Have a Lesser Expectation of Privacy at the Border..	20
2.	The Container In Which the Defendant's Files Were Housed Does Not Impact the Analysis..	21
3.	The Search of the Defendant's Electronic Data Was Reasonable..	21
C.	Suppression Is Not the Remedy For An Impermissible Search of Attorney-Client Privileged Files..	22
D.	The Potential To Search An Attorney's Files Does Not Impact the Attorney-Client Relationship..	23
III.	THE DEFENDANT IS NOT ENTITLED TO AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING.....	24
	CONCLUSION.....	26
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

PAGE

FEDERAL CASES

<i>Andresen v. Maryland</i> , 427 U.S. 463 (1976).	18
<i>Boyd v. United States</i> , 116 U.S. 616 (1886).	6
<i>Carroll v. United States</i> , 267 U.S. 153 (1925).	7
<i>Davis v. Gracey</i> , 111 F.3d 1472 (10th Cir. 1997).	13
<i>Henderson v. United States</i> , 390 F.2d 805(9th Cir. 1967).	5, 8
<i>In re Grand Jury Subpoenas</i> , 926 F.2d 847 (9th Cir. 1991).	18, 22
<i>O'Connor v. Ortega</i> , 480 U.S. 709 (1987).	15
<i>Ralls v. United States</i> , 52 F.3d 223 (9th Cir. 1995).	23
<i>Witt v. United States</i> , 287 F.2d 389 (9th Cir. 1961).	6
<i>Wyoming v. Houghton</i> , 526 U.S. 295 (1999).	13
<i>United States v. 12 200-Ft. Reels of Super 8mm Film</i> , 413 U.S. 124 (1973).	8, 16
<i>United States v. Adjani</i> , 452 F.3d 1140 (9th Cir. 2006).	14
<i>United States v. Al-Marri</i> , 230 F. Supp. 2d 535 (S.D.N.Y. 2002).	13
<i>United States v. Arnold</i> , 454 F. Supp. 2d 999 (C.D. Cal. 2006).	2
<i>United States v. Barth</i> , 26 F. Supp. 2d 929 (W.D. Tex. 1998).	13
<i>United States v. Borello</i> , 766 F.2d 46 (2d Cir. 1985).	8
<i>United States v. Camacho</i> , 368 F.3d 1182 (9th Cir. 2004).	9, 13
<i>United States v. Carey</i> , 172 F.3d 1268 (10th Cir. 1999).	14
<i>United States v. Chan</i> , 840 F. Supp. 531 (N.D. Cal. 1993).	13
<i>United States v. Chaudhry</i> , 424 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 2005).	10
<i>United States v. Cortez-Rocha</i> , 394 F.3d 1115 (9th Cir. 2005).	10, 16
<i>United States v. David</i> , 756 F. Supp. 1385 (D. Nev. 1991).	14
<i>United States v. Ek</i> , 676 F.2d 379 (9th Cir. 1982).	13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (Cont'd)

	PAGE
<i>United States v. Flores-Montano</i> , 424 F.3d 1044 (9th Cir. 2005) (per curiam).	10
<i>United States v. Flores-Montano</i> , 541 U.S. 149 (2004).	Passim
<i>United States v. Fortna</i> , 796 F.2d 724 (5th Cir. 1986).	8
<i>United States v. Friedman</i> , 210 F.3d 227 (4th Cir. 2000).	18, 19
<i>United States v. Gonzalez-Rincon</i> , 36 F.3d 859 (9th Cir. 1994).	13
<i>United States v. Grayson</i> , 597 F.2d 1225 (9th Cir. 1979).	8
<i>United States v. Guadalupe-Garza</i> , 421 F.2d 876 (9th Cir. 1970).	7
<i>United States v. Humphreys</i> , 982 F.2d 254 (8th Cir. 1993).	18, 22, 23
<i>United States v. Howell</i> , 231 F.3d 615 (9th Cir. 2000).	24
<i>United States v. Ickes</i> , 393 F.3d 501 (4th Cir. 2005).	11, 16
<i>United States v. Irving</i> , 2003 WL 22127913 (S.D.N.Y. 2003).	11, 12
<i>United States v. Irving</i> , 452 F.3d 110 (2d Cir. N.Y. 2006).	12
<i>United States v. Martinez-Fuente</i> , 428 U.S. 543 (1976).	16
<i>United States v. Mittleman</i> , 999 F.2d 440 (9th Cir. 1993).	18, 21, 22
<i>United States v. Modes</i> , 787 F. Supp. 1466 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1992).	20, 21
<i>United States v. Molina-Tarazon</i> , 279 F.3d 709 (9th Cir. 2002).	9
<i>United States v. Okafor</i> , 285 F.3d 842 (9th Cir. 2002).	7, 13, 15
<i>United States v. Roberts</i> , 274 F.3d 1007 (5th Cir. 2001).	11
<i>United States v. Roberts</i> , 86 F. Supp. 2d 678 (S.D. Tex. 2000).	11
<i>United States v. Romm</i> , 455 F.3d 990 (9th Cir. 2006).	12
<i>United States v. Ross</i> , 456 U.S. 798 (1982).	7, 8, 16
<i>United States v. Runyon</i> , 275 F.3d 449 (5th Cir. 2001).	14
<i>United States v. Schoor</i> , 597 F.2d 1303 (9th Cir. 1979).	8
<i>United States v. Thirty-Seven Photographs</i> , 402 U.S. 363 (1971).	7, 8, 16
<i>United States v. Tsai</i> , 282 F.3d 690 (9th Cir. 2002).	8
<i>United States v. Upham</i> , 168 F.3d 532 (1st Cir. 1999).	13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (Cont'd)

	PAGE
<i>United States v. Villamonte-Marquez</i> , 462 U.S. 579 (1983).....	6
FEDERAL STATUTES	
19 U.S.C. § 1305.	15
19 U.S.C. § 1461.	6
19 U.S.C. § 1496.	6
19 U.S.C. § 1582.	6
FEDERAL REGULATIONS	
19 C.F.R. § 101.1.....	6
19 C.F.R. § 162.6.....	6
19 C.F.R. § 133.22.....	15
19 C.F.R. §133.42	15